

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the office action dated December 8, 2010. By this amendment, Applicant has canceled the alleged new matter in the specification and further amended claims 17 and 18. In addition, Applicant is submitting terminal disclaimers. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Terminal disclaimers

The Examiner rejected claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 for obviousness type double patenting. Specifically, the rejections are as follows:

“Claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-168 of U.S. Patent No. 7,839,984. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 of the present application are anticipated by claims 1-168 of the patent.

Claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-91 of U.S. Patent No. 7,835,509. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 of the present application are anticipated by claims 1-91 of the patent.

Claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-87 of U.S. Patent No. 7,835,508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 of the present application are anticipated by claims 1-87 of the patent.

Claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-195 of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,894. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 17-38, 40-50, 52-67 of the present application are anticipated by claims 1-195 of the patent.”

Although Applicant submits that the present claims are distinct from the claims of the prior patents, in order to conclude prosecution of the present application, terminal disclaimers with respect to Patent Nos. 7,839,984; 7,835,509; 7,835,508; 6,323,894 are provided with this response.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues, Applicant and the undersigned respectfully request the Examiner to contact the undersigned to resolve them.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: June 8, 2011

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

9229 Sunset Blvd., Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860